



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/075,167	02/14/2002	Jerry Zucker	534P011c/p	8019

7590
Kevin S. Lemack
Nields & Lemack
176 E. Main Street
Westboro, MA 01581

07/14/2003

EXAMINER

ALEJANDRO, RAYMOND

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1745

DATE MAILED: 07/14/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Applicant(s)

10/075,167

Applicant(s)

ZUCKER, JERRY

Examiner

Raymond Alejandro

Art Unit

1745

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 June 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 3-12, 26-32, 36-39 and 42 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 13-25, 33-35, 40 and 41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 February 2002 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3 and 6. 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election of Group I and Species 3 (claims 1-2, 20-25, 33-35, 40-41 {generic} and claims 13-19 {species}) in Paper No. 7 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Priority

2. Applicant's claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. 120 is acknowledged. Although the prior application (parent application with a serial number 09/957602) is still pending, applicant is advised that the status of the nonprovisional parent application referenced (whether patented or abandoned) should be included.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 05/31/02 (paper # 3) considered by the examiner.

4. A third-party submission has been filed under 37 CFR 1.99 on 05/23/03 (paper # 6) in the published application.

To ensure that a third-party submission does not amount to a protest or pre-grant opposition, 37 CFR 1.99 does not permit the third party to have the right to insist that the examiner consider any of the patents or publications submitted. Furthermore, if the submission is not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.99, some or all of the information submitted may be discarded

Art Unit: 1745

prior to the time the examiner receives the submission. Therefore, unless the examiner clearly cites a patent or publication on form PTO-892, Notice of References Cited and such reference is used in a rejection or its relevance is actually discussed during prosecution, consideration by the examiner of any patent or publication submitted in a third-party submission cannot be presumed.

If the applicant wants to ensure that the information in a third-party submission is considered by the examiner, the applicant should submit the information in an IDS in compliance with 37 CFR 1.97 and 37 CFR 1.98. An individual who has a duty to disclose under 37 CFR 1.56 should also submit any material information contained in a third-party submission to the Office in an IDS in compliance with 37 CFR 1.97 and 37 CFR 1.98 to ensure such material information is properly disclosed to the examiner.

5. However, in view of the foregoing, applicant is herein offered an opportunity to file any comments regarding the patents or publications submitted by the third-party submission. Any comments should be filed within the later of the time period set forth in this Office action or one month from the mailing of this Office communication.

Drawings

6. The drawings are objected to because Figure 1 contains the following typographical error: the term “Figur” should be changed to “Figure”. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Art Unit: 1745

Specification

7. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

8. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: in the specification, (page 20, line 32) the term "membran" should be changed to "membrane". Appropriate correction is required. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Double Patenting

9. A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

10. Claims 1-2, 20-25, 33-35 and 40-41 are provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-2, 5-10, 18-20 and 25-26 of copending

Art Unit: 1745

Application No. 09/957602 (*US Publication No: US 2003/0054232*). This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

The copending application'602 (US Publication'232) claims the following (claims 1-2, 5-10, 18-20 and 25-26):

1. A battery separator comprising at least one fibrous layer and at least one support layer, wherein said support layer is formed of an acid-resistant material and comprises a plurality of macroscopic openings.

2. A battery separator according to claim 1, wherein the fibrous layer has an average pore size of 3 to 15 μm .

5. A battery separator according to claim 1, wherein the fibrous layer has a thickness of 0.2 mm to 3.6 mm.

6. A battery separator according to claim 1, wherein the openings of the support layer cover more than 60% of the surface of the support layer.

7. A battery separator according to claim 6, wherein the openings of the support layer cover more than 70% of the surface of the support layer.

8. A battery separator according to claim 7, wherein the openings of the support layer cover more than 80% of the surface of the support layer.

9. A battery separator according to claim 8, wherein the openings of the support layer cover more than 90% of the surface of the support layer.

10. A battery separator according to claim 1, wherein the openings are spaced apart 0.01 to 5 mm.

18. A battery separator according to claim 1, wherein at least two opposing edge regions of the support layer are not covered by the fibrous layer to provide edges for sealing.

19. A battery separator according to claim 1, wherein the openings of the support layer have a greatest possible diameter of more than 1 mm.

20. A battery separator according to claim 1, wherein the openings of the support layer have the form of slots or long holes.



Art Unit: 1745

25. A battery separator according to claim 1, wherein the support layer has a thickness of 0.01 to 1 mm.

26. A battery separator according to claim 1, wherein the separator has the form of a pocket with an open top, a closed bottom and closed sides.

NOTE: Additionally-Potential Double Patenting:

Applicant is advised that if during the prosecution the invention of claims 1-2, 20-25, 33-35 and 40-41 be shifted to claim the invention of claims 3-4, 26-32, 36-39 or 42 (now withdrawn from consideration):

i) claims 3, 26-32, 36-39 or 42 will be provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 3, 11-17, 21-24 or and 27 of copending Application No. 09/957602 (US Publication No: US 2003/0054232); and

ii) claim 4 will be provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 4 of copending Application No. 09/957602 (US Publication No: US 2003/0054232). (*In this case, claim 4 of the present application represents an obvious variation of claim 4 of the copending application '607 (US Publication '233).*

The foregoing will be applicable unless applicant cancels or amends the potentially conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope; and/or properly addresses and resolves the double patenting rejections.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claims 1, 13, 18-25, 34-35 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aidman et al 5376477 in view of Van Sacken et al 5747188.

The present application is directed to a battery separator wherein the disclosed inventive concept comprises the specific acid resistant material layer and its macroscopic openings. Other limitations include the specific pore size; the layer thickness; the specific porosity; the opening spacing; the edges for sealing; the diameter; the holes/slots and the pocket shape.

With respect to claim 1:

Aidman et al disclose a battery plate separator system including three layers in face-to-face relationship, the first and third layers including a porous mat of fibers and between the first and third layers, a second layer comprising a porous organic polymeric sheet with pores (ABSTRACT). It is disclosed that the first and third layers comprise porous mat made of fibers made of glass wherein these mats preferably have a porosity of at least about 90 % (COL 1, lines 43-51). *It is noted that Aidman et al disclose two (2) porous fibrous layers and one (1) porous polymeric layer, thus, either one of the two porous fibrous layer or the porous polymeric layer acts as the support layer in the separator system; in addition, the three (3) layers do have openings or pores because they all are porous.* Aidman et al also disclose that the separators are to be used in lead-acid batteries (COL 1, lines 37-40/COL 1, lines 43-46) as well as that the

Art Unit: 1745

separator system is inert to the electrolyte (COL 2, lines 3-5). *Thus, the layered separator system of Aidman et al is an acid-resistant material.*

With reference to claims 13 and 18-19:

Aidman et al disclose that the first and third layers comprise porous mats made of fibers wherein these fibers are made of glass and an organic polymeric material such as polyethylene or polypropylene (COL 1, lines 45-50). *Thus, the fibrous layer comprises fibers of glass and fibers of an organic polymeric material.*

As for claim 20:

Aidman et al teach in EXAMPLE 1 that the porous fibrous mats have a thickness of 0.013 inch (0.3302 mm); the flat porous thermoplastic sheet measures 0.010 inch (0.254 mm) in thickness (COL 2, lines 65 to COL 3, lines 2). Two additional batteries were made wherein each separator system contained the porous fibrous mat has a thickness of 0.026 inch (0.6604 mm) (COL 3, lines 12-16).

With respect to claims 21-24:

It is disclosed that the first and third layers comprise porous mat made of fibers made of glass wherein these mats preferably have a porosity of at least about 90 % (COL 1, lines 43-51). *Thus, the openings of the layers cover more than 60 %, 70%, 80% and 90%.*

As for claim 25:

Aidman et al disclose the layers comprising porous made of fibers having a porosity of at least about 90 % (COL 1, lines 50-51). *It is thus noted that the specific spacing of the openings is inherent because in embodiments comprising an open area in excess of 90 %, the openings are accordingly formed in closely spaced relationship and separated only by thin land areas of*

Art Unit: 1745

material so as to meet the claimed space or distance between two openings. In this regard, attention is directed to applicant's disclosure (page 15, third full-paragraph) wherein it is recognized that when the open area is more than 90 %, the openings are closely spaced between one another. Hence, since Aidman et al's layers have a porosity of at least 90 %, the opening spacing in the separator of Aidman et al does exhibit the same spacing characteristic.

As for claim 35:

Aidman et al disclose that layers are comprises porous mats or porous sheets (COL 1, lines 46-47/ COL 1, lines 52-54). *It is noted that since the mats or sheets are porous they possess or have pores, and thus, pores are minute openings by which matter passes through a membrane, thus, the openings of the layer, at least, have the form of holes.*

As for claim 40:

Aidman et al teach in EXAMPLE 1 that the porous fibrous mats have a thickness of 0.013 inch (0.3302 mm); the flat porous thermoplastic sheet measures 0.010 inch (0.254 mm) in thickness (COL 2, lines 65 to COL 3, lines 2). Two additional batteries were made wherein each separator system contained the porous fibrous mat has a thickness of 0.026 inch (0.6604 mm) (COL 3, lines 12-16).

Aidman et al disclose a separator system comprising layers according to the above-mentioned aspects. However, Aidman et al do not expressly disclose the openings (pore) being macroscopic and the specific diameter of the openings.

With respect to claim 1:

Van Sacken et al disclose a battery separator wherein the outer separator section comprises a plurality of macroscopic holes (COL 3, lines 47-50/ COL 4, lines 40-44).

Art Unit: 1745

With respect to claim 34:

Van Sacken et al disclose that the separator comprises a plurality of macroscopic holes greater than 1 μm in size (COL 8, lines 38-47). *It is noted that macroscopic holes greater than 1 μm in size does encompasses openings having a diameter of more than 1 mm. Thus, the prior art reference teaches the use of macroscopic holes having the claimed diameter (SEE MPEP 2144.05 Obviousness of Ranges and In re Geisler 43 USPQ2d 1362).*

In view of these disclosures, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to make the macroscopic openings of Van Sacken et al in the battery separator of Aidman et al as Van Sacken et al teach that separator comprising a plurality of macroscopic holes serves as the internal shorting means of the battery. Accordingly, by incorporating the separator comprising the plurality of macroscopic holes inside the battery container an improved safety behavior is achieved because it provides an extrinsic internal shorting means which is geometrically configured with respect to the electrode features such that an extrinsic internal short is created in the extrinsic shorting region or regions upon application of the increasing non-uniform pressure. Further, the provision of an extrinsic region wherein an extrinsic internal short occurs prior to impedance matching prevents maximum power dissipation from occurring in the intrinsic region or regions alone. Thus, the maximum local heating in any single region is reduced. Additionally, since the extrinsic internal short occurs outside the active electrode assembly, energy can be dissipated in a region that may be less sensitive chemically to heat generation and hence less prone to a runaway reaction. Thus, separators having the plurality of macroscopic openings, when used in a battery, provide an improved safety behavior under

Art Unit: 1745

conditions of mechanical abuse, in particular crush type abuse. Further, Van Sacken et al teach that the embodiments of the invention can be of various sizes, designs and electrochemistries.

With respect to the specific diameter of the openings, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to make separator layer of Aidman et al by having the specific opening diameter of Van Sacken et al as Van Sacken et al teach that separator comprising a plurality of macroscopic holes serves as the extrinsic internal shorting means of the battery, as discussed in the immediately preceding paragraph, and hence such separators having the plurality of macroscopic openings, when used in a battery, provides an improved safety behavior under conditions of mechanical abuse, in particular crush type abuse. *It is also noted that macroscopic holes greater than 1 μm in size does encompasses openings having a diameter of more than 1 mm. Thus, the prior art reference teaches the use of macroscopic holes within claimed diameter (SEE MPEP 2144.05 Obviousness of Ranges and In re Geisler 43 USPQ2d 1362).*

13. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aidman et al 5376477 in view of Van Sacken et al 5747188 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Okada et al 4725516.

Aidman et al and Van Sacken et al are applied, argued and incorporated herein for the reasons above. In addition, Aidman et al and Van Sacken et al do not disclose the specific average pore size of the separator layer.

Art Unit: 1745

Okada et al teach a battery separator having an average pore diameter of about 7 μm (CLAIM 7/COL 6, lines 11-15); or an average pore diameter of about 3 μm (COL 6, lines 11-15).

In view of the above, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to make the specific average pore size (diameter) of the separator layer of Okada et al in the separator layer of both Aidman et al and Van Sacken et al as Okada et al teach that by selecting appropriately the separators within the suitable claimed range of pore diameter an improved distribution of the electrolyte content of the cell element is achieved. Thus, it allows constructing sized plates comprising a larger amount of electrolyte contained in the positive and negative active materials than that in the separators, so that the amount of electrolyte in the positive and negative active materials does not decrease and the total volume of electrolyte in the cell is not reduced due to overcharging conditions. Further, separators having the specific pore diameter distribution possess electrolyte absorption properties and retention capabilities which are desirable in order to establish the condition that only the electrolyte in the separators decreases and the electrolyte in the positive and negative plates remains filling them when the total amount of electrolyte is decreased. Thus, the electrolyte absorption and retention power of separator is enhanced.

14. Claims 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aidman et al 5376477 in view of Van Sacken et al 5747188 as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of Waterhouse 4363856.

Art Unit: 1745

Aidman et al and Van Sacken et al are applied, argued and incorporated herein for the reasons above. In addition, Aidman et al and Van Sacken et al do not disclose the specific diameter of the glass fiber and polymeric fiber.

As to claims 14-15:

Waterhouse discloses a battery separator wherein glass fibers may be incorporated into the battery separator material, preferably, the glass fibers have fiber diameters less than 20 microns as the mean diameter. Exemplary of the glass fibers are the glass microfibers, those having fiber diameters of 0.20 to 4.0 microns (COL 2, lines 52-66).

As to claims 16-17:

Waterhouse discloses a battery separator material comprising polyolefin fibers such as polyethylene, polypropylene and have a fiber diameter of up to 100 microns; preferably, these polyolefin fibers have a fiber diameter of 0.01 to 20 microns (ABSTRACT/COL 2, lines 9-20).

EXAMPLE 1 shows the use of a polymeric fiber with an average fiber diameter of 4.9 microns (COL 6, lines 20-24).

In view of the above, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to make the glass fiber of both Aidman et al and Van Sacken et al by having the specific glass fiber diameter of Waterhouse as Waterhouse teaches that exemplary of the glass fibers useful in the practice of his invention are the glass microfibers having fiber diameters of 0.20-4.0 micron because these glass fibers, when incorporated into the battery separator material per se, impart rigidity and tensile strength while maintaining the inert chemical characteristics and low ohmic resistance of the battery separator. Thus, the prior art reference

Art Unit: 1745

directly teaches the use of glass fiber diameters within the claimed range (*SEE MPEP 2144.05 Obviousness of Ranges and In re Geisler 43 USPQ2d 1362*).

With respect to the specific diameter of the polymeric fiber, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to make the polymeric fiber of both Aidman et al and Van Sacken et al by having the specific polymeric fiber diameter of Waterhouse because Waterhouse teaches that preferably these polyolefins fibers have a fiber diameter of 0.01 to 20 microns because these polyolefin fibers (polymeric fibers) are suitable to be used as separator material because they have low ohmic resistance due to their diameter and have sufficient flexibility so that the final battery separator material can be folded and worked while providing good envelope integrity and ease of processing on papermaking equipment. Hence, there is provided a separator material having excellent filtering, electrical, chemical and physical properties. Thus, the prior art reference directly teaches the use of polymeric fiber diameters within the claimed range (*SEE MPEP 2144.05 Obviousness of Ranges and In re Geisler 43 USPQ2d 1362*).

15. Claims 33 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aidman et al 5376477 in view of Van Sacken et al 5747188 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Fraser-Bell et al US 2002/0106557.

Aidman et al and Van Sacken et al are applied, argued and incorporated herein for the reasons above. In addition, Aidman et al and Van Sacken et al do not disclose the specific edge regions for sealing and the separator having the form of a pocket.

Art Unit: 1745

With respect to claims 33 and 41:

Fraser-Bell et al disclose a separator assembly wherein if the user wishes to seal the separator assembly such that the separator assembly fully envelopes the electrode, the width of the second layer may be greater than the width of the electrode and the width of the first layer (SECTION 0033). In such an embodiment, the longitudinal edges of the second layer would extend beyond longitudinal edges 26 of the electrode and the longitudinal edges of the first layer so that the longitudinal edges of the second layer, which are in face-to-face relationship after being folded around the electrode (SECTION 0033), may be bonded to each other and thereby form a pouch around the fully envelope electrode. The fully envelope electrode may be sealed along the lower portion, the upper portion, or along the longitudinal side edges of the electrode/separator assembly combination (SECTION 0033). *It is noted that a pouch has a pocket/bag shape with an open top, a closed-bottom and closed sides.*

In view of the above, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to make the specific edge regions of Fraser-Bell et al in the separator layer of both Aidman et al and Van Sacken et al because Fraser-Bell et al teach that if the user wishes to seal the separator assembly such that the separator assembly fully envelopes the electrode, the width of the second layer may be greater than the width of the electrode and the width of the first layer, that is to say, the longitudinal edges of the second layer would extend beyond longitudinal edges of the electrode and the longitudinal edges of the first layer so that the longitudinal edges of the second layer may be bonded to each other. Thus, the edges region of the separator assists to seal and bond the electrode/separator assembly.

Art Unit: 1745

As to the specific the separator having the form of a pocket, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to make the separator of both Aidman et al and Van Sacken et al by having specific form of a pocket (pouch) of Fraser-Bell et al because Fraser-Bell et al teach that the pocket (pouch) shaped separator serve to fully envelope the electrode, thereby enhancing the sealing of the electrode/separator assembly.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Raymond Alejandro whose telephone number is (703) 306-3326. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday (8:30 am - 7:00 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick J. Ryan can be reached on (703) 308-2383. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9310 for regular communications and (703) 872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

Raymond Alejandro
Examiner
Art Unit 1745

